



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 11, 2003

The Honorable John Anthony  
Mayor  
City of Naples  
P.O. Box 340  
Naples, Texas 75568

OR2003-5562

Dear Mr. Anthony:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 185655.

The City of Naples (the "city") received a request for nine categories of information, including certain resumes and tour of duty. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information to the requestor. You also state that the city does not maintain some of the requested information. We note that the Public Information Act (the "Act") does not require the city to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). However, we understand you to claim that the resumes and tour of duty are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or

representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You failed to request a decision from this office within ten business days of receiving the request for information. Additionally, you have failed to submit to this office a copy of the requested tour of duty or a representative sample thereof. Finally, you have also failed to submit a copy of the requested resumes within fifteen business days of receiving the request for information. Thus, the city has failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Section 552.108 of the Government Code, which protects law enforcement interests, is a discretionary exception and generally does not provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 586 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.108), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). *But see* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 586 at 3 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason under section 552.302). Therefore, you may not withhold the requested tour of duty under section 552.108 of the Government Code, and it must be released. However, in regard to the submitted resumes, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). As you assert section 552.102 of the Government Code, we will address it accordingly.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code protects "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." The test for determining whether information is excepted under section 552.102 is the same as the one used to decide whether it is protected by the common-law right to privacy under section 552.101.<sup>1</sup> *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the common-law right to privacy.

1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Prior decisions of this office have found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure). In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989) (individual's mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), certain personal choices relating to financial transactions between the individual and the governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Having reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that portions of the information, which we have marked, are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we conclude that the remaining submitted information consists solely of information regarding the employment of the individuals in question and, thus, is of legitimate concern to the public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performances or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (absent special circumstances, home addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens generally not protected under privacy exceptions of Public Information Act). Therefore, the remaining submitted information is not confidential under common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Additionally, section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number" of a peace officer, or that reveals whether the peace officer has family members. We note that a former spouse does not constitute a family member for purposes of section 552.117(a)(2). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Finally, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas driver's license information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.102(a), 552.117(a)(2), and 552.130 of the Government Code. All remaining requested information maintained by the city must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/sdk

Ref: ID# 185655

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mack Barrington  
c/o John Anthony  
City of Naples  
P.O. Box 340  
Naples, Texas 75568  
(w/o enclosures)